DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 304 989 HE 022 293

TITLE	A Futures-Creating Guide. Long Range Planning from the Future for the Future.
INSTITUTION	American Association of State Colleges and Universities, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	88
NOTE	71p.
AVAILABLE FROM	Academic Programs, American Association of State Colleges and Universities, One Dupont Circle, Suite 700, Washington, DC 20036-1192 ($7.00 members).
PUB TYPE	Guides - Non-Classroom Use (055)
EDRS PRICE	MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS	Change; Educational Assessment; *Educational Policy; *Futures (of Society); Higher Education; Influences; *Long Range Planning; Models; Objectives; *Policy Formation

ABSTRACT

A process by which institutions of higher education can plan for change with the times, come to terms with the dynamics of change, and initiate adaptation to a perceived future is presented. This guide is intended to be an outline for action that can be adapted to the diverse range of operations and governance current in American colleges and universities. It presents a revision of the "Futures-Creating Paradigm" model developed a decade ago by the Resource Center of the American Association of State Colleges and Universities (AASCU). A method for interdisciplinary policy planning is provided and includes planning exercises to help academic advisors anticipate social, political, and economic trends and incorporate them into their mission and policy goals. The 10 planning stages to be considered are: defining external and internal influences; building a matrix for policy development; formulating institutional objectives; examining the compatibility of objectives; designing an evaluation and assessment plan; planning strategies for implementation; examining feasibility; formulating the policy statements; presenting the plan; and revisiting the plan. Each section includes details on the topic as well as worksheets to assist in the planning process. (SM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED304989

A
Futures-Creating Guide

Long-Range Planning from the Future for the Future

Academic Affairs Resource Center
◇
American Association of State Colleges and Universities

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

AASCU

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

HE 022 293

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

A Futures-Creating Guide

Long-Range Planning from the Future for the Future

Academic Affairs Resource Center

◇

American Association of State Colleges and Universities

copyright © 1988 AASCU *Academic Affairs Resource Center*

Contents

A Futures-Creating Guide

Preface 5

Introduction
The Guide in Brief 7

Stage 1
Defining External and Internal Influences 13

Stage 2
Building a Matrix for Policy Development 23

Stage 3
Formulating Institutional Objectives 31

Stage 4
Examining the Compatibility of Objectives 39

Stage 5
Designing an Evaluation and Assessment Plan 49

Stage 6
Planning Strategies for Implementation 53

Stage 7
Examining Feasibility 59

Stage 8
Formulating the Policy Statements 67

Stage 9
Presenting the Plan 71

Stage 10
Revisiting the Plan 73

Preface

A Futures-Creating Guide

Long range planning has become commonplace in higher education during the last half of the twentieth century. This document presents a revision of the *Futures-Creating Paradigm*, a model developed some ten years ago by the Resource Center of the American Association of State Colleges and Universities. As the subtitle of the earlier version indicates, this approach is based on "planning from the future for the future."

In the spirit of the original document, the Academic Affairs Resource Center of AASCU has reviewed the *Futures-Creating Paradigm*. The interest has been to revise, modify, and improve the model. The revision is a reaffirmation of AASCU'S process of sharing both knowledge and experience. Through a series of regional and national meetings, a team of academic vice presidents worked with their colleagues to prepare this new version of the paradigm.

This guide proposes a process by which institutions of higher education can plan for change with the times, come to terms with the dynamics of change, and initiate adaptation to a perceived future. The process suggested is not intended to be prescriptive; it is a paradigm, an outline for action that can be adapted to the wide and diverse range of operations and governance current in American colleges and universities.

Many persons have contributed to this new edition. The late John Osmon provided much of the initial framework and inspiration for the *Futures-Creating Paradigm*. The revision was led by Wesley Face, University Wisconsin-Stout, and Robert L. Reid, University of Southern Indiana, two of the participants in the initial planning workshop held in 1977. Darrell Krueger and Margarita Heisserer, Northeast Missouri State University, provided invaluable support in rewriting the text and designing new worksheets. A Resource Center committee–Irving Buchen, Ralph Hemphill, Frank Marini, and Mary Elizabeth Shutler–gave early guidance, and Robert Hively served as editorial consultant.

Introduction

A Futures-Creating Guide

Two fundamental understandings set the context for *A Futures-Creating Guide*. The first is a recognition that change is a permanent aspect of the human condition. Since the dawn of civilization, people have struggled to reconcile the uncertainties and vagaries of change with the need for stability and order. The role of education in society is the theme of the second understanding. Education provides a vehicle for balancing the tension between the old and the new, the past and the future. In describing this role at the post-secondary level, the 1978 guide said:

> *All of our people, whether adolescent, mid-career, or senior citizens, have a right to expect their colleges and universities not only to help them cope, but to help them live happy and productive lives through the acquisition of the kinds of knowledge, skills, understanding, and attitudes that institutions of higher education can provide.*

In terms of institutions of higher learning today, John Gardner's observation seems particularly pertinent: the problem is not change *per se*, but rather the management of change. What must concern us here requires a broad base of support for the two major groups involved: the institutions (corporate), which must change, and the people, who have to respond to, plan for, and manage the changes that will emerge for them. History has taught us that inevitably these changes will emerge. If, however, some of these changes can be anticipated, institutions of higher education will be able to incorporate considerations of the social, technical, political, and economic trends and shifts in our value systems into their missions and policy goals. These areas can provide the context that initiates the process to effective policy; thus, defining significant contextual areas for the next decade is very important and will enable educational institutions to offer programs and services more precisely tuned to the needs of individuals in the emerging society.

The formulation of policy for the accomplishment of specific aims or purposes is a generative concept that lies at the heart of the development of America's colleges and universities. It can reasonably be argued that the transition process, which has marked the growth of educational institutions, consists of the actualization of various planning efforts and their subsequent incorporation into the educational institutions. Some of these efforts may have been more comprehensive than others; some have manifested an imaginative and innovative approach; some certainly have proved effective; but all were planning efforts of one kind or another.

It is the short-range planning process that has been most frequently undertaken. Indeed, conventional wisdom tells us that the next year–or two or three–must be planned so that institutions can continue to function, programs can be developed and institutionalized, and students can be taught. But whether this kind of short-range planning accurately reflects anything more than current standards of societal and institutional milieux remains questionable. Standards are generally defined by conditions within and without; yet existing conditions do not remain "existing" very long in the form in which they were found, defined, and molded into standards. Conditions, as we have seen, are fluid, even uncertain. Standards, then, become the status quo, while conditions change around them: soon standards no longer reflect the new existing conditions. Too often for institutions of higher learning, the status quo is reflected in budgetary decisions, personnel commitments, and set poli-

Introduction

A Futures-Creating Guide

cies and procedures that are not flexible; it is more than likely that probable futures were not even considered when these policies were formulated. Thus, it is evident that to change any of these elements is both difficult and necessary. It is difficult because to propose change means (1) to define the shape of change and (2) to make this elusive shape and the institution's mission "fit"; but it is necessary because change will come about whether we acknowledge it or ignore it. Institutional changes to accommodate the future must be looked at and worked with, however painful may be the process of the required course of action that will emerge.

It is to deal adequately with the future and attendant changes that this *Futures-Creating Guide* is presented. The guide has a longer time frame than most planning processes, one that extends through the decade ahead. Such a time frame gives the planning process the opportunity to move forward effectively. It must be noted here that frequently long-range planning as an approach to the future has been sidestepped by many institutions, at least as far as programmatic considerations are concerned. We do seem quite readily disposed to project student enrollments, physical facility requirements, and in some instances, anticipated revenues. Whether we are equally disposed to project future societal changes and their impact upon educational needs remains to be seen. Obviously, recognizing new needs means new academic programs, or, at the very least, different emphases in ongoing programs.

It is not surprising that opinions vary about the probability of initiating changes within the institution, changes that will accurately reflect shifts in trends and values and thereby educate for the future. However, it seems shortsighted and frequently counterproductive to continue as we are now, not looking beyond a year or two, and thus sidestepping a splendid opportunity for higher education to come to terms with the dynamics of change.

The mantle of futures-creating thinking and planning should not sit strangely or uncomfortably upon the shoulders of leaders in higher education. If colleges and universities are particularly appropriate institutions to equip people for the future, it is because, for the most part, higher education occupies a position of trust, guidance, and preparation in this fluctuating world. We cannot deny our mandate, nor can we wish to lessen the significance of this enviable image. There is, indeed, every reason to believe that colleges and universities can help people face the future and respond to inevitable changes with a reasonable degree of confidence. Once this future has been given a recognizable shape, it becomes possible to initiate policies and procedures to educate toward it. Many within our institutions believe–or are willing to examine–this possibility. It is to them, and other open-minded professionals, that this guide proposing a process to prepare for the future is directed.

The Guide in Brief

In order to plan relevant and productive policy in the face of an indefinite future, the contextual areas from which futures-determining forces will arise and influence the mission of the institution must be defined, selected, described, and analyzed. Long-range planning of institutional policy must be undertaken from a knowledge base and from the exploration of the institutional impacts of trends in the coming decade. Otherwise, planning is likely to result in incomplete and ineffective policy.

Introduction

A Futures-Creating Guide

The *Futures-Creating Guide* provides a method for interdisciplinary policy planning in institutions of higher education. Policy planning embraces both the setting of institutional objectives and the design of strategies and tactics toward their attainment. Trends and events constitute the sources of data for planning; the product of the planning is policy that anticipates future alternatives even as it guides current choices.

There are ten planning stages to be considered in the *Futures-Creating Guide*. The stages are described briefly in this section of the planning guide. In the second section, each stage is discussed more fully and planning procedures are described in detail.

Institutions that will adopt the guide for long-range policy planning already know that to be effective, any planning process must be continuous. The data generated and the policies formulated in this process must be subject to continual reexamination and restatement in light of an unfolding future. And, although the planning guide presents the planning stages in sequence, the reader will note many instances where information generated at an advanced stage will inform, and possibly modify, deliberations tentatively concluded at an earlier stage.

The planning guide does not prescribe either the structure or the participants in the long-range policy planning process. The unique circumstances and traditions of each institution will, by and large, influence the specifics of implementation of the process. By way of general guidance, however, this planning process is fueled by interdisciplinary knowledge and pluralistic points of view. The procedures for the planning stages will accommodate relatively large numbers of participants: faculty members, administrators, students, alumni, members of governing boards, and the local community. Even with this participative approach, the institution will likely be served best if responsibility for coordination of the process is lodged in the mainstream of institutional planning and governance.

Stage 1—Identifying External and Internal Influences

The context of influences affects the mission of the college or university. The areas within society from which trends can be specified and traced will be called external influences. These external influences can be identified and then component trends traced with reasonable accuracy and a sense of confidence for a decade or so; their effects can be anticipated. External forces may fall into such categories as these:

- population
- government
- global affairs
- environment
- economy
- science and technology.

The institution will also determine if there are internal influences occurring at the institution which should be considered as part of the planning process. The following set of categories has been developed for the purpose of illustration:

- tradition of governance
- economic strength
- academic quality
- institutional stability
- research capabilities
- internal demographic patterns
- relationship with governing bodies.

The set of categories is not exhaustive. Other areas may be of equal or greater importance and perhaps more germane to any one institution's needs. Stage 1, then, calls for the institution to identify both external and internal areas it believes will have impact on policy planning in its management of change.

Stage 2—Building a Matrix for Policy Development

Once the influences have been identified, it becomes possible to project through the utilization of the policy-making format the effects they are likely to have on selected sectors of the institution. The sectors, identified for illustration, are: students, faculty, curricula, research and development, public service, internal resource allocation, facilities, external resources, administration. The projections of the effects on these sectors will vary. Both desirable and undesirable effects may emerge.

Stage 3—Formulating the Institutional Objectives

The development of policies to guide the institution beyond the next decade can now be initiated. When the matrices have been completed and the desirable and undesirable effects of the anticipated trends have been traced, the planners are ready to formulate institutional objectives. (The reader should recall that policies contain objectives and the means for their achievement.) There is no limit to the number of objectives to be developed; all are to be included in a comprehensive set of objective statements.

Stage 3 calls for the planners to develop institutional objectives. Once they have been stated, objectives must be supported by data. Thus, the planners must further describe each objective in relation to the institution's mission, the impacts of influences, and the specific indicators demonstrating achievement of the objective.

Stage 4—Examining the Compatibility of Objectives

Planners can anticipate possible difficulties ahead by testing the compatibility of their objectives.

To this end, compatibility must be ascertained between objectives and (1) the institution's current mission statement, (2) external and internal influences, and (3) each of the other objectives formulated by the planners. Evidence of incompatibility can be considered in light of additional data to be generated in later planning stages in order to make judgments about pursuing, modifying, or abandoning proposed policies.

Stage 5—Designing an Evaluation and Assessment Plan

Sound planning requires objective indicators to assess the environment and the validity of projections. Relative to the planning process, the design and development of an assessment model will produce many benefits: (1) regular assessment procedures prompt an institution to establish clear goals and objectives in planning; (2) systematic assessment informs an institution whether or not it is accomplishing the purposes, goals, and objectives identified; (3) assessment provides an ethos for planning and an evaluation of outcomes as the plan emerges; (4) an assessment program promotes the development of strategies taken toward achieving objectives and toward meeting the future; and (5) a viable assessment program heightens expectation levels and stimulates efforts to achieve the planning goals.

Multiple measures of assessment will portray in graphic terms the cumulative effect of a whole set of facts and events. An assessment program, and the empirical data it provides, will help answer the questions: How does the university know it is accomplishing its purposes? How does the university know it has effectively organized its resources? What does the university need to do to attain the desired results and goals? Will the university continue to accomplish its purposes? Assessment becomes the interface between idealism and pragmatism in combining a sense of mission to all levels of the university community with an evaluation process which verifies the attainment of objectives.

Hence, this stage of the planning process explores the actual results and the desired future in measurable terms. Assessment examines the condition brought about or anticipated as a result of the implementation of policy.

Stage 6—Planning Strategies for Implementation

The guide calls for Stage 6 to build a futures history. What this stage requires is planning from the future; that is, to set a specific year–say 1999–for the objective's realization and then to plan back from it, stating what events, strategies, and tactics will have had to take place in order to bring about that objective. This is the essence of planning from the future for the future because, in this Aristotelian model, the ideas must now be created (potentiality) and transformed into events (actuality).

Stage 7—Examining Feasibility

Of course, underlying the institution's ability to implement policy is the question of feasibility. The exploration of this critical issue is taken up near the end of the process in order to allow maximum margin to the creative potential of the *Futures-Creating Guide*. Simply, the flow of the process should not be interrupted; it must be permitted to open up and go as far as the planners are able to take it.

Feasibility means evaluating constraints imposed upon and identified as a result of planning. National, sometimes universal, certainly regional and institutional perspectives must be considered. Clearly some or all of an institution's characteristics and requirements which color that perspective may present inhibiting factors that must be addressed. Stage 7 recognizes the relevance of feasibility in the execution of the policy-planning process; it asks the institution to determine the feasibility of the proposed policies as weighed against societal and institutional constraints.

Stage 8—Formulating the Policy Statements

The development of policy statements to guide an institution through planned change is a culminating activity of the entire futures planning process. The formulation of policies requires an overview of the completed plan and a complete understanding of all the information, predictions, and conclusions accumulated in successive planning stages.

Basic outlines for policy will be well in place if the planning process has followed the stages of this guide.

Stage 9—Presenting the Plan

At this stage, the planning committee will have completed its designs, and the plan is ready for presentation.

The planning team that has finished its assignment will have developed a strong loyalty and sense of ownership in its work, and enthusiasm will be tempered with the realization that all colleagues may not share the team's confidence. The widest possible spectrum of faculty and staff support must be sought.

Stage 10—Revisiting the Plan

Final approval and formal adoption of a recommended plan do not end the functional aspects of planning. At this stage, although the projected provisions for implementation and assessment are made operative, and a design for monitoring should be in place, periodic overviews should also be scheduled.

Stage 1

Defining External and Internal Influences

Exploration of the impacts of societal influences on educational institutions provides the knowledge base for long-range planning. From these data fairly accurate and conclusive assumptions can be made regarding relevant change that is likely to occur within a planning time frame. The definition, selection, description, and analysis of external influences, (i.e., societal, regional, local) and internal influences (i.e. institutional) can provide an informed anticipation of the future that can be incorporated into policy.

After identifying and defining influences and their operative areas, planners must assess the impact each will have on specific purposes, policies, and projections. The changes that are brought about by significant societal issues profoundly affect the missions and directions of colleges and universities as well as the programs and activities designed to achieve their respective missions. Recognizing and defining significant influences that will engage education and demand planning for their accommodation is vital at the level of survival. On the level of operations, an effective analysis enables institutions to offer programs and services more precisely tuned to the needs of individuals and community interests of an evolving society. Institutional policies, by virtue of an institution's purpose, are especially sensitive to shifts in both internal and external influences.

The institution will want to establish a mechanism for the identification of issues likely to have serious impact. The institution may choose to wait and establish an interdisciplinary committee with the responsibility of identifying significant issues and trends. Another option would be to assign the responsibility to an existing office. New influences can be discovered through a review of the existing literature of futurists, or in some cases the planners may wish to identify influences by analysis of contemporary events and make their own assumptions as to the resulting trend.

Stage 1 calls for an institution to identify both external and internal influences it believes will have impact on its existence and operations.

To assist the institution in completing this stage, a list of possible external and internal influences is provided. It is suggested that the institution analyze these in terms of assumption and counter-assumption. Through argument, discussion, and analysis, a set of statements will emerge which establishes the foundation for successful planning for the future.

Stage 1

Defining External and Internal Influences

A. External Influences
   1. Population
      a. Racial and ethnic changes
      b. Longevity trends
      c. Geographic shifts
   2. Government
      a. Federal subsidy of higher education
      b. Authority of state and local government
      c. Demands for institutional accountability
   3. Global Affairs
      a. Political stability
      b. Cultural diffusion
      c. Interdependence
      d. Economic competition
   4. Environment
      a. Ecological concerns
      b. Cultural value shifts
      c. Changing family structure
      d. Urbanization
      e. Increase of leisure time
   5. Economy
      a. Energy sources and costs
      b. National economic condition
      c. Consumer power
   6. Science and Technology
      a. Changing work patterns
      b. Educational requirements
      c. On-campus utilization of technology
   7. Other . . .

B. Internal influences
   1. Institutional values
   2. Tradition of governance
   3. Economic strength
   4. Academic quality
   5. Institutional status
   6. Research capabilities
   7. Internal demographic patterns
   8. Relationships with governing bodies
   9. Other . . .

Worksheet: Defining Assumptions and Counter-Assumptions

External Influences	*Assumptions*	*Counter-Assumptions*
I. Population		
A. Racial and ethnic changes	Minority populations--Black, Hispanics, and Asian--will continue to grow at a rate faster than the general population.	All minorities may not increase their enrollment in college in proportion to their percentage increase in the population.
B. Longevity trends	The elderly will continue to increase as a percentage of the total population.	The elderly will decrease as a percentage of the total population.
	AIDS will dominate all health concerns during the next decade.	AIDS will be held in check or eliminated during the next decade.
C. Geographic Shifts	The movement of industry toward the sunbelt will continue.	The rustbelt will regain some of its industrial strength.
II. Government		
A. Federal subsidy for higher education	The decrease of federal subsidies for education, especially student aid, will be continued or decreased.	A new federal administration will make education a financial priority.
	Education will have high priority in funding by the federal government.	Social issues, other than education (e.g., health care), will have higher priority in funding decisions.
B. Authority of state and local government	Control of higher education by state and local governments will increase, including entrance requirements, assessment, and hiring qualifications.	State and local governments will maintain institutional autonomy.

Stage 1

Defining External and Internal Influences

External Influences	*Assumptions*	*Counter-Assumptions*
C. Demands for institutional accountability	States, and perhaps the federal government, will require testing for baccalaureate degrees and teacher certificates.	States will permit institutions to determine mission and standards.
III. Global Affairs		
A. Political stability	Balance of world power and maintenance of peace are likely.	Conflict or even war could disrupt the American nation.
B. Cultural diffusion	The many races and cultures of the U.S. will blend, in the cities and on campuses.	Racism will increase and cause deep division. American society will develop increasing pluralism.
C. Interdependence	The nations of the world will continue to increase their interdependence, economically and socially.	Nations will regain some of their former independent and isolated powers.
D. Economic competition	Economic competition among nations will increase and result in political and economic disadvantages for the U.S.	The U.S. will prosper and find advantage in international relations.
IV. Environment		
A. Ecological concerns	Emphasis will be placed on conservation, water sources, purification, and pollution control.	Resources will be ignored, resulting in their depletion and probable contamination.
B. Cultural value shifts	A trend toward continued unity will foster a mutual support of values held in common by most of the population.	A trend toward increased pluralism will contribute to a culture of multiple values, some of which will be in conflict and cause division in the population.

Stage 1

Defining External and Internal Influences

External Influences	*Assumptions*	*Counter-Assumptions*
C. Changing family structure	The divorce rate will continue to rise.	More stable marriages will be the rule.
	Fewer children will be born.	The birthrate will increase.
	Single parent families will increase.	Fewer single parent families will be the rule.
	Teen-age pregnancy will decrease, affecting college and university involvement.	Teen-age pregnancy, suicide, and social resignation will increase.
D. Urbanization	The cities will continue to grow and attract people back from the suburbs.	The suburbs will be the growth areas of the future.
E. Leisure time	Work patterns will allow greater amounts of leisure time.	Changing family structures will result in greater responsibilities; less leisure time will be available.
	People will use increased leisure time for recreational and educational activities.	People will use increased leisure time for more television viewing and other passive activity, e.g., spectator sports, drinking, drugs.
V. Economy		
A. Energy sources and costs	Oil prices will rise again to earlier levels.	Drop in oil prices or greater reliance on nuclear power will keep energy costs low.
B. National economic condition	The U.S. economy will regain its relative strength.	The economy will become weaker.

Stage 1

Defining External and Internal Influences

External Influences	*Assumptions*	*Counter-Assumptions*
C. Consumer power	Inflation will stay under four percent during the next decade.	Inflation will rise above current levels.
	Unemployment will remain steady or drop.	Unemployment will increase.
VI. Science and Technology		
A. Changing work patterns	Many more people will be involved in serving the information and high tech society.	A few people with computer power will serve the information needs of society.
	The technological revolution will allow many people to perform salaried work in their homes.	People will be required to report to offices and factories.
	The work week will generally be shorter.	A few well-trained people will work long hours and others not at all.
	Automation will put many people out of work.	The required manpower level for the GNP will stay constant or increase.
B. Educational requirements	Many people will need higher levels of education in a technological society.	A few highly-trained people will suffice.
	Older workers will need retraining to include technological skills.	Older workers cannot be retrained for a technological age and will not be needed.
	The development of new technology will dramatically change curricula and instructional methods.	Most technology in the classroom is a fad and will always be ineffective.
VII. Other external influences		

Stage 1

Defining External and Internal Influences

External Influences	***Assumptions***	***Counter-Assumptions***

Stage 1

Defining External and Internal Influences

Internal Influences	*Assumptions*	*Counter-Assumptions*
I. Institutional Values	Institutional values will remain the same as they have been traditionally.	Changes in faculty, students, or administration will change institutional values.
II. Governance	The faculty will play a strong role in governing the institution.	The administration or governing board will be more powerful in university governance.
	Collective bargaining will become stronger on campuses.	Collective bargaining will diminish or maintain present strength.
III. Institutional financial resources	Financial resources will remain at approximately the present levels.	The financial condition of the institution will improve or worsen.
IV. Academic Quality	The academic quality of the institution will remain at its present level.	The academic quality will improve or decline.
	As competition for students increases, the more able students will be recruited by prestigious universities; the others will enroll students with fewer abilities.	Able students will continue to choose among all institutions, contributing to a distribution of student abilities.
V. Institutional status	The institution will maintain its present status relative to others in the state and nation.	The institution will improve or reduce its status relative to others in the state and nation.
VI. Research capabilities	Research capability and accomplishment will improve in the future.	Research capabilities will be reduced.
	Demands for larger teaching loads will leave less time for research.	Time for research will be maintained at present levels or increased.

VII. Internal demographic patterns	The institution will increase percentage of minority students through strong recruitment and retention.	The institution will not attract a greater number of minority students.
	Older students will make up a greater part of the population of the institution in the future.	The age distribution at the institution will remain constant.
VIII. Relationship with governing bodies	The governing body will continue to exercise the present level of authority.	The authority of the governing body will increase.
	The governing body will demand more accountability and assessment from the institution.	The governing body will make accountability and assessment the responsibility of the institution.
IX. Curricular demands	The current department structure and the traditional curriculum will be maintained.	New disciplines and interdisciplinary programs will be necessary.
	The current mixture of liberal arts and professional courses will continue.	The liberal arts will become stronger or weaker in the university's curriculum.
		The liberal arts will make way for a greater number of professional courses.
	Remedial courses will continue at current levels or increase.	Remedial courses will be discontinued.
	New instructional delivery systems will require curricular changes.	New delivery systems will not require curricular changes.
X. Other internal influences		

Stage 1

Defining External and Internal Influences

Internal Influences	Assumptions	Counter-Assumptions

Stage 2

Building a Matrix for Policy Development

Having established external and internal influences, the next stage examines their impact upon the institution. To do this, a conceptual framework in the form of a matrix is needed.

Stage II, then, calls for the construction of a matrix for tracing the anticipated impacts of all identifiable influences on the various sectors of an institution during the chosen span for future planning, which is ten years in this guide.

The completed matrix will provide a framework for the development of policies that can direct an institution more effectively into the future. The finished matrix will consist of cells which will identify the impact of an influence on a sector of the university. The planning team may identify any internal sector, but at this stage, all aspects of the university which are a part of the planning process should be considered.

The potential impact should be considered in terms of a series of criteria formulated by planners. The ultimate question to be answered is: What will be the impact of this specific issue on this particular sector during the next ten years?

Stage 2

Building a Matrix for Policy Development

A. Suggested sectors
   1. Students
   2. Faculty
   3. Curricula
   4. Research and development
   5. Public service
   6. Internal resource allocation
   7. Facilities
   8. External resources
   9. Administration

B. Suggested criteria
   1. The probability of the impact: how great?
   2. The timing of the impact: when?
   3. The intensity of the impact: how great?
   4. The duration of the impact: how long?
   5. The reversibility of the impact: how likely is it to be modified?
   6. The scale of the impact: how broad?
   7. The determination of links with other impacts: how much intrinsic strength?

WORKSHEET: Matrix for Policy Development—External Influences

ASK: What will be the impact of this trend area on the sectors at this institution through the projected period?

CONSIDER:
- the probability of the impact: how great?
- the intensity of the impact: how likely is it to be modified?
- the reversibility of the impact: how likely is it to be modified?
- the determination of links with other impacts: how much intrinsic strength?
- the timing of the impact: when?
- the duration of the impact: how long?
- the scale of the impact: how broad?

Sectors	External Influences							
	Population	Government	Global Affairs	Environment	Economy	Science & Technology	Other	Other
Students								
Faculty								
Curricula								
Research and Development								
Public Service								
Internal Resources								
Facilities								
External Resources								
Administration								
Other								

WORKSHEET: Matrix for Policy Development—Internal Influences

NOTE:

ASK: What will be the impact of this trend on the sectors at this institution through the projected period?

CONSIDER:
- the probability of the impact: how great?
- the intensity of the impact: how great?
- the reversibility of the impact: how likely is it be modified?
- the determination of links with other impacts: how much intrinsic strength?
- the timing of the impact: when?
- the duration of the impact: how long?
- the scale of the impact: how broad?

Sectors	Internal Influences							
	Institutional Values	Tradition of Governance	Economic Strength	Academic Quality	Institutional Status	Research Capabilities	Internal Demographic Patterns	Relationships with Governing Bodies
Students								
Faculty								
Curricula								
Research and Development								
Public Service								
Internal Resources								
Facilities								
External Resources								
Administration								
Other								

27

ALTERNATE WORKSHEET: Framework for Policy Development

External Influences

Area: _____

Ask: What will be the impact on the sectors at this institution through the projected period (3-, 5-, 10-year period)?

I. Students

II. Faculty

III. Curricula

IV. Research and Development

V. Public Service

VI. Internal Resources

VII. Facilities

VIII. External Resources

IX. Administration

X. Other

ALTERNATE WORKSHEET: Framework for Policy Development

Internal Influences

Area: _____

Ask: What will be the impact on the sectors at this institution through the projected period (3-,5-,10-year period)?

I. **Students**

II. **Faculty**

III. **Curricula**

IV. **Research and Development**

V. **Public Service**

VI. **Internal Resources**

VII. **Facilities**

VIII. **External Resources**

IX. **Administration**

X. **Other**

Stage 3

Formulating Institutional Objectives

When influences have been traced, possible and relevant futures predicted, and the impact of these on the institution forecast, planners are ready to formulate institutional objectives. At this stage, a clear distinction must be maintained between the stated mission and the objectives that will be adopted to achieve that mission. Because mission statements are usually phrased in more abstract and general terms, a wide variety of objectives, even some with opposing directions, often can be identified as supportive of broadly stated long-range goals.

The institutional mission must be sufficiently comprehensive to guide all relevant components in their common and well-defined directions, and an institution, in preparing or revising a mission statement, must first define itself. The worksheet is suggestive, but certainly not exhaustive, of analyses that can contribute to a definition of mission.

It is evident that the adoption of institutional objectives is a major part of the formulation of institutional policy. Objectives translate institutional purpose or mission into operational terms. A checklist should demonstrate that all of the stated purposes of an institution are supported by the adopted objectives and that all objectives support declared goals without ambiguity, qualification, or rationalization.

In planning, the questions asked are, "What are we doing now?" and "What can we do in the future to best achieve our institutional purpose?" The answers, a list of suggestions from all sectors of the institution, will provide a pool of possible (and impossible) potential objectives. Adoptions (and rejections) will be a part of the total planning for the future, with due attention to influences, anticipated change, institutional values, and a maximum of informative and supportive data as outlined in this guide.

In this emphasis on the formulation of objectives it is appropriate to observe that as they may be changed radically in futures planning, an institution's mission may also be subject to revision. The recognition of a conflict between its stated goals and what appears to be necessary objectives is a strong signal for a penetrating analysis of its *raison d'être*.

Objectives will develop uniquely in each institution out of its own view of the future, its own mission, and the collective will and interests of its total constituency. The compilation and analysis of data as outlined in this guide will assist in the recognition of appropriate and necessary objectives consistent with long-range planning. Although some objectives are common to most of higher education, their actual "fit" in total operations and their implementation and synthesis in local systems will tend to be institutionally specific.

Stage 3

Formulating Institutional Objectives

A. Reviewing Institutional Mission (optional)

B. Identifying potential institutional objectives
   1. Examine the impact statements developed from the policy-making matrices
   2. Develop reasonable objectives for each sector to respond to impacts
      a. Students
      b. Faculty
      c. Curricula
      d. Research and development
      e. Public service
      f. Internal resource allocation
      g. Facilities
      h. External resources
      i. Administration
      j. Other
   3. Use simple, declarative sentences to state each objective

C. Formulating an institutional objective
   1. Identify the institutional objective
   2. Refer to the institutional mission
   3. Refer to the external assumptions (trends and values)
   4. Transfer the impact statements that describe the need for this objective
   5. Identify the desired results that will indicate the objective has indeed been achieved (performance measures)

Worksheet One—Reviewing Institutional Mission: Institutional Profile *(Optional)*

Types of Institute Compared
- Comprehensive
- Liberal Arts
- Technical

Level of Program
- Graduate
- Four-year
- Two-year Area: State-wide

Service Area
- State-wide
- Regional
- National

Funding
- Public
- Private
- Multiple

Admissions
- Very selective
- Selective
- Open
- Space-bound applications
- Institution 1st choice? 2nd choice?

Age Served
- Traditional
- Non-traditional
- Multiple

Enrollment
- Percentage minorities
- Percentage in remedial classifications
- Percentage in honors

Stage 3

Formulating Institutional Objectives

Teaching Modes
- Traditional
- Eclectic
- Small classes
- Large classes

Dominant Research Activities
- Academic
- Science and technology (applied)
- Science and technology (exploratory)
- No significant research

Population Served
- Urban
- Rural
- In-state (regional) percentage
- Out-of-state percentage
- Foreign

Dominant External Constituencies
- Board/legislature
- Alumni
- Patrons/boosters
- Supportive but non-contributing public
- Business community

Degree Requirements
- Extensive-maximal
- Fewer than 10 cr. hrs. of electives in 4-yr. program
- Liberal
- 10 to 20 cr. hrs of electives in 4-yr. program
- Minimal
- 30 or more cr. hrs. of elective in 4-yr. program

Endowment
- Compared with similar institutions
- Appropriateness to operations

Academic Support
- Library
- Laboratories and equipment
- Faculty ratios
- Class size
- Sabbaticals and faculty development

Mission—Your Institutional Purposes

Worksheet

Type of Institution _____

_____

Level of Programs _____

_____

Funding Type _____

_____

Service Area _____

_____

Admissions _____

_____

Age Served _____

_____

Primary Population Served _____

_____

Research _____

_____

Housing _____

_____

Other _____

_____

_____

_____

Athletic emphasis
- Varsity teams (major sports and minor sports)
- Profits/losses
- Athletic/academic salaries compared
- Male/female participation compared
- Intramural programs

WORKSHEET TWO: Formulating Institutional Objectives

What are several reasonable objectives that the impact statements suggest might be appropriate?

I. Students
   1.
   2.
   3.

II. Faculty
   1.
   2.
   3.

III. Curricula
   1.
   2.
   3.

IV. Research and Development
   1.
   2.
   3.

V. Public Service
   1.
   2.
   3.

VI. Internal Resources
   1.
   2.
   3.

VII. Facilities
   1.
   2.
   3.

VIII. External Resources
   1.
   2.
   3.

IX. Administration
   1.
   2.
   3.

X. Other
   1.
   2.
   3.

36

WORKSHEET THREE: Formulating Institutional Objectives

What performance measures can be used to indicate achievement of the institutional objectives?

I. Students
1.
2.
3.

II. Faculty
1.
2.
3.

III. Curricula
1.
2.
3.

IV. Research and Development
1.
2.
3.

V. Public Service
1.
2.
3.

VI. Internal Resources
1.
2.
3.

VII. Facilities
1.
2.
3.

VIII. External Resources
1.
2.
3.

IX. Administration
1.
2.
3.

X. Other
1.
2.
3.

37

WORKSHEET FOUR: Formulating Institutional Objectives

In short narrative sentences. . .

Identify the objective

Refer to the institutional mission

Refer to the impact matrices

Specify indicators of achievement

Write out the description of each objective you wish to achieve in the coming decade and move it backward through time, using a similar series of descriptive statements to arrive at today.

38

Stage 4

Examining the Compatibility of Objectives

At this stage in planning, it is critical to test all of the objectives that have been identified and tentatively accepted in all institutional sectors. They should be evaluated by three simultaneous comparisons:

(1) with the institutional mission, to determine their harmony with and support of the stated mission;
(2) with each other, to determine that all objectives can coexist without opposing negative effects;
(3) with anticipated influences and future values, to perceive the extent to which the objectives reflect predictions.

The process of determining predictability of objectives with these three tests requires acute perception and sensitivity. The starting point is an institution's mission or statement of purpose. Because any statement of purpose is usually a collection of goals, each discrete goal must be identified in the appraisal of objectives. A matrix has been designed to search for incompatibilities among possible objectives.

If in the testing, an objective is found to be questionable or not consistent with other planning, it need not be eliminated from other consideration. As planning continues, it is possible that initially rejected objectives can be recovered and be adopted. In the initial sort, some objectives will be readily acceptable, some will be rejected, and some will be held for possible inclusion at a later time.

If a pattern of questionable or rejected objectives develops because of incompatibility with the institutional mission, but the objectives are otherwise supportable, perhaps the mission and its goals should be examined.

39

Stage 4

Examining the Compatibility of Objectives

A. Testing compatibility with institutional mission
   1. Cull the goals from the mission statement in such a way that the range of the objectives and the sectors are mirrored
   2. Ask the question that tests the compatibility of each institutional objective with each institutional goal
   3. Rate the compatibility
      a. Is it harmonious with the institutional goal?
      b. Is it neutral? Or does it affect or detract from the institutional goal?
      c. Will it negatively affect the institutional goal?
   4. Analyze negative responses
      a. What causes the problem?
      b. How significant is it?
      c. Is the problem one of wording?
      d. Is the difficulty with the objective or the institutional goal?

B. Testing compatibility with other objectives
   1. Check for intersector relationships
      a. Are they compatible?
      b. Are they neutral?
      c. Are they incompatible?
   2. Analyze neutral impacts
      a. Are they a result of fuzziness of language or concept?
      b. Do they signify that objectives are unrelated to each other?
      c. Do they indicate a need for some linkages?
   3. Analyze incompatible impacts
      a. Is there conflict or contradiction?
      b. Why does the uncompatibility exist?
      c. What is the corrective solution?

C. Testing compatibility with impact of external and internal influences
   1. Data base decision: data related to trends/values vs. objectives
   2. Value-laden decision: value-laden objectives vs. value-laden trends
   3. Intervention decision: institutional self-fulfillment vs. unsupportive predicted trends

WORKSHEET ONE: Examining the Compatibility of Objectives
Testing Compatibility of OBJECTIVES with INSTITUTIONAL MISSION (Goals)

Draw up a list of your institutional goals from your mission statement.

code:
C = compatible
N = neutral
I = incompatible

	Institutional Goals							
Objectives	1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	7.	8.
1.								
2.								
3.								
4.								
5.								
6.								
7.								
8.								
9.								
10.								

code:
C = compatible
N = neutral
I = incompatible

WORKSHEET TWO: Examining the Compatibility of Objectives
Testing Compatibility of OBJECTIVES with Other OBJECTIVES

	Objectives									
Objectives	1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	7.	8.	9.	10.
1.										
2.										
3.										
4.										
5.										
6.										
7.										
8.										
9.										
10.										

WORKSHEET THREE: Examining the Compatibility of Objectives

Testing Compatibility of OBJECTIVES with EXTERNAL INFLUENCES

code:
C = compatible
N = neutral
I = incompatible

	External Influences							
Objectives	Population	Government	Global Affairs	Environment	Economy	Science & Technology	Other	Other
1.								
2.								
3.								
4.								
5.								
6.								
7.								
8.								
9.								
10.								

code:
C = compatible
N = neutral
I = incompatible

WORKSHEET FOUR: Examining the Compatibility of Objectives
Testing Compatibility of OBJECTIVES with INTERNAL INFLUENCES

	Internal Influences							
Objectives	Institutional Values	Tradition of Governance	Economic Strength	Academic Quality	Institutional Status	Research Capabilities	Internal Demographic Patterns	Relationships with Governing Bodies
1.								
2.								
3.								
4.								
5.								
6.								
7.								
8.								
9.								
10.								

Stage 5

Designing an Evaluation and Assessment Plan

Sound planning requires predetermined measures set in place to assess the consistency of stated objectives and the effectiveness of strategies and tactics that are used to implement them. Systematic assessment informs an institution whether it is accomplishing the purposes, goals, and objectives it has identified and, at the same time, because effective assessment demands well-defined goals and objectives, it imposes a continuing qualitative appraisal of stated objectives. Assessment serves as both a qualifier and as an evaluator in planning.

Moreover, an assessment program maps the directions of strategies and measures their success in achieving objectives and maintaining a surveyed route to the future. Assessment, if applied properly and effectively, can provide graphic, sometimes dramatic, display of the cumulative effect of whole sets of data; the ideal is measured by reality. Fair and effective assessment can become an interface between idealism and pragmatism.

In the planning stage, the promise of objective appraisal in both planning and in its implementation can be a source of confidence and loyal support at all levels of the university.

When an institution can measure its efforts to accommodate change, it is able to evaluate its courses of action and to discover when alternatives in planning may be necessary. An assessment program, and the empirical data it provides, should be devised to answer such broad questions as: How successful is the university in achieving its stated purposes and goals? How effective are the strategies that are in place to effect change? How supportive are the staff and faculty of the design for change that may have been put in place and how supportive are they of continuing to plan for change?

At the same time, effective assessment both in planning and in implementation will appraise the fulfillments of specific and particular commitments of faculty and staff, budget, space, external involvement and support (including legislative or governing boards), and any other entities that make contracts or give unqualified assurances in adopted planning. Frequently the construction of devices for the assessment of some phases of planning may be more difficult than the planning itself, but it is vital.

Assessment can also be more reliable if appropriate and effective instruments to measure probable outcomes of specific objectives are devised with particular attention to the differences in achievement-directed and attitude-directed goals. If anticipated results are clearly understood in all their dimensions, they can be appraised with greater certainty.

Stage 5

Designing an Evaluation and Assessment Plan

A. Assess the achievement of objectives in the various sectors
   1. Students
   2. Faculty
   3. Curricula
   4. Research and development
   5. Public service
   6. Internal resource allocation
   7. Facilities
   8. External Resources
   9. Administration
   10. Other

B. Choose the high leverage points
   1. Select those specific to the institution
   2. Identify points for each sector
   3. Select points which best reflect the final condition and the achievement for goals
   4. Analyze on a short-term, a mid-term, and/or long-term basis
   5. Example–Assess the objective for the student sector at the following points
      a. Incoming student, e.g., at summer orientation
      b. Enrolled student, e.g., end of the sophomore year
      c. Graduating student, e.g., last semester of enrollment
      d. Alumni, e.g., 10-year, 5-year, 3-,2-,1-year
      e. Employers of graduates

C. Identify assessment instruments and strategies
   1. Select instruments and strategies consistent with institutional goals and objectives
   2. Identify multiple measures to strengthen the validity of assessment
   3. Focus attention on learning throughout the assessment process
   4. Examples of instruments–Student Sector
      a. Nationally normed examinations
      b. Locally developed examinations
      c. Survey instruments
      d. Faculty evaluations of students: grades and other
      e. Placement records

D. Define data collection and utilization
   1. Utilize all data available: demographic, ability, achievement, survey, etc.
   2. Assemble desired data elements in format easily understood and communicated
   3. Analyze by organizational units of the university
   4. Provide longitudinal data over the projected period to show unit direction/progress
   5. Consider both negative and positive impacts and results
   6. Project what will be the result–the final condition–on the specific sector at the end of the projected period

WORKSHEET ONE: Designing an Evaluation and Assessment Plan

What will be the desired result caused by the objective on the sector at the end of the projected period (3,5,10 years from now)?
What measures will be utilized to verify the achievement of the desired result in the particular sector(s)?

Sectors		Objectives							
		1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	7.	8.
STUDENTS	Result								
	Measures								
FACULTY	Result								
	Measures								
CURRICULA	Result								
	Measures								
RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT	Result								
	Measures								
PUBLIC SERVICE	Result								
	Measures								
INTERNAL RESOURCES	Result								
	Measures								
FACILITIES	Result								
	Measures								
EXTERNAL RESOURCES	Result								
	Measures								
ADMINISTRATION	Result								
	Measures								
OTHER	Result								
	Measures								

Stage 6

Planning Strategies for Implementation

With all objectives firmly in place, strategies for their accomplishment must be considered with a firm determination to be realistic and uncompromising. The best of planning for goals and objectives will fall short without effective designs for implementation.

In Stage 4, the compatibility of objectives was analyzed. In Stage 5, an evaluation and assessment program was developed. Now, the relationship of strategies must be considered. As specific actions are planned to achieve a given objective, are they mutually compatible with other strategies that will be necessary to carry out a master plan? Are strategies under consideration competitive or conflicting? Can they all be given equal support?

Basic to devising strategies is an understanding of the cultural readiness of the institution to support any considered implementation. The broadest possible participation of the university community in all facets of early planning will enhance this readiness. The design, the process, and the products of planning must all be viewed by the university community as their collective province. Without such involvement, implementation of any plan probably will be difficult, perhaps impossible, and will not reach to the core and spirit of the institution where, ultimately, effective change must be supported. Simply, people must be willing and able to do what is asked of them.

Resistance to undertakings that demand effort and commitment to achieve results that are to be realized in what may seem to some a very distant future is probable. Confidence and support can be increased by the built-in devices of assessment and evaluation emphasized in Stage 5. It is the appearance of the unknown or the incalculable in the future that can give rise to apprehension, resistance, or debate. If visible and operable processes of appraisal are in place, and their use is assured, prospects will be seen as more secure.

Basically, planners in a given institution with on-campus experience and an immediate on-site view should be able to appraise the probable support and resistance to planned policies and their implementation. With a clear and unbiased appraisal, planning can and must include design to neutralize foreseen resistance and to overcome any tendencies toward defeatism or retreat.

A valuable part of implementation as well as assessment is planning *from* the future. Application of this concept involves choosing a specific year for the realization of an objective, for example, a five- or ten-year projection, and determining the time and place for specific events that should take place during that span. At any given time an analysis will reveal whether or not such events are occurring as anticipated and give some indication of the effectiveness of implementation. Planning *from* the future is appropriate to consideration under assessment and evaluation, but at the same time the anticipation of events is a part of the consideration of strategic planning.

The mechanics of implementation will generate out of specific targets in planning. Strategies, therefore, will vary by institution and by the specific demands of specific objectives. Most will require detailed blueprints with assignments of financing, space, personnel, and schedules as appropriate and according to the resources of an institution.

All implementation should have within its design of application provisions for revision.

Stage 6

Planning Strategies for Implementation

The importance of evaluation and assessment has been stressed, but these are empty processes if they cannot be used to alter a course when new directions may be required to reach the principal goals of long-range planning. Implementation is a process that must be manipulable.

In planning objectives, strategies, and tactics, each becomes a test of the other. Objectives for which no effective strategies can be formulated must be reconsidered. Strategies that cannot be supported by available tactics must be redirected.

In the final analysis, implementation tests the abilities, interest, and will of the collective persona of an institution; it is, or should be, a process of people working according to their own plans, to achieve their adopted objectives, in the service of their institution.

Stage 6

Planning Strategies for Implementation

A. Theory of implementation
   1. Promote commitment to a planning culture
   2. Create a cultural readiness for implementation
   3. Involve the university community in all facets of planning process and desired outcomes
   4. Exhibit an attitude of confidence toward the future
   5. Map out the implementation plan, projecting priorities and alternatives
   6. Be flexible; learn from error and begin anew
   7. Base implementation plan on knowledge and realization while experimenting with and experiencing changes
   8. Meet challenges with determination
   9. Approach action tactics from the future for the future

B. Methodology of implementation
   1. Identify strategies
      a. State the tactical objective
      b. Describe the tactical objective
      c. Pose the strategies to attain objective
      d. Set priorities
      e. Indicate the consequences expected
      f. Involve all strategic areas
      g. Define resources affected: human and physical/technical
      h. Define staff responsibilities
      i. Identify data collection and analyze to pinpoint effectiveness
      j. Review strategies: revise as deemed necessary
   2. Plan action programs
      a. Move from the future to the present through a series of actions
      b. Identify actions of specific units and areas of responsibilities
      c. Involve entire university community as much as possible to enhance the university planning culture
      d. Correlate events and actions to mission, goals, and objectives
      e. Provide or suggest method of accountability
      f. Review and revise actions as needed
   3. Coordinate strategies and actions of units with total plan
      a. Integrate action programs
      b. Share issues and successes with university community
      c. Determine effectiveness in attaining objectives
      d. Anticipate the future rather than react to the present
      e. Use the plan as the basis for decision-making

C. Implementation: a checklist
   1. State the specific tactical objective
   2. List all possible strategies to achieve objective
   3. Define priorities and any conflicts in strategies
   4. List specifically all expected outcomes

55

Stage 6

Planning Strategies for Implementation

5. Note impact on other objectives, strategies
6. Define personnel and faculty/staff responsibilities
7. Outline detailed program for monitoring and review
8. Provide for revision
9. Appraise acceptance and support by university community
10. If necessary, design a plan to win and maintain acceptance and support
11. Adopt clearly defined and programmed strategy

WORKSHEET ONE: Planning Implementation Strategies
Identifying Strategies for the Realization of an Objective

Institutional Goal No. _____
Potential Policy No. _____
The Specific Objective: _____

_____ **Strategy:**
date

_____

_____ **Strategy:**
date

_____

_____ **Strategy:**
date

_____

_____ **Strategy:**
date

_____

57

WORKSHEET TWO: Planning Implementation Strategies
Conceptualizing the Future

1. Strategy No. _____ Goal (_____):

2. Measure
(1)

(2)

(3)

58

Stage 7

Examining Feasibility

This stage calls for an appraisal of the probabilities of success or failure for completed plans. Now is the time to ask, "Which of our objectives can be accomplished?"

Consideration of this critical issue has been postponed to this stage to permit planning that could be generated without the inhibition or restraint that might be imposed by a continuing concern for feasibility. During the planning stages the creative potential of the *Futures-Creating Guide* should not be restricted by an overlay of limits or conditions. Simply, the flow of planning should not be interrupted. As the objectives, strategies, and tactics emerge in the development of the long-range plan, they should not be impeded by considerations, particularly feasibility, that derive from outside their own relationships or dynamics.

Now, however, it is at this stage that the validity of objectives projected by the paradigm in a given institution can be reviewed and evaluated. If the resources, human or physical, required to implement a planned action cannot be assigned and assured according to design, planners must accept the necessity of revising their expectations, expanding their resources, or developing new strategies to deflect or overcome opposition.

It is probable that the most prevalent cause of failed planning is the reluctance of planners to forego objectives, regardless of their attractiveness and desirability, when support is questionable. To put a plan or phase of a plan in place with its success dependent upon an optimistic hope that "something will turn up or conditions will change" will lead inevitably to disappointment. Sound planning anticipates contingencies, but it is not designed to depend upon them.

At this stage, completed plans must be viewed in national, regional, and local perspectives. What is their prospect for acceptance in the social and political environments that frame the institution? Will the identifiable constituencies of the institution understand the public statements of objectives, embrace them, and support them?

The recognition of probable objection or dispute, however, should not be sufficient cause to abandon desirable objectives; this is a time for aggressive rather than submissive decision.

In the appraisal of feasibility in long-range planning, an institution must make carefully calculated judgments as to what extent it can influence or control what may be seen as deterrent forces, intramural and extramural. Valuable, perhaps vital, objectives that may seem to be vulnerable to opposition may be maintained by a planned address to the sources of such opposition. Planning can have within its strategies designs that are specifically targeted to overcome anticipated opposition.

In effect, at this stage, if forces detrimental to portions of the plans that have been adopted can be foreseen, and if the objectives are sufficiently valuable, additional strategies can be devised and built into the long-range perspective to ameliorate or eliminate opposition.

A study of feasibility then becomes not only an analysis of potential constraints; it considers the possible accommodation of those restraints in order to retain desirable objectives.

The following checklist of pertinent influences or controls of feasibility are a

59

Stage 7

Examining Feasibility

compilation of suggestions made by administrators experienced in planning. Not all of them may be applicable to all institutions and some, such as references to inflation, may seem topical. In a ten-year span, however, the topical can assume the proportions of the universal, and that is one of the many challenges of long-range planning, the key element of design "from the future for the future."

Some of the items will be recognized as repetitions of concerns identified in previous stages. Such repetition only emphasizes the integral or symbiotic process of effective planning. For example, the appraisal of support expected from staff and faculty is pertinent to every stage of this guide. It is important to all planning and certainly is central to any measure of feasibility.

Planners, as they collect data, identify objectives, and devise strategy and tactics, following the pattern of this guide for planning, will soon recognize the close and dynamic relationship of all sectors of educational institutions. None exists alone, and all must be considered in the planning for any one of them.

Having identified feasible objectives and having determined the evaluation and assessment plans and the strategy for implementation of each, planners have in effect formulated a statement of policy. The long-range plan thus consists of a series of policy statements.

Stage 7

Examining Feasibility

A. Consider potential national constraints
   1. Basic changes in population structure and movement
   2. Rising costs and shortages in energy
   3. Rising costs and shortages in capital
   4. Higher costs and shortages in materials of all kinds
   5. Overall economic slow-up with increasing inflation
   6. Continuing concern for environmental quality
   7. National legislation and regulatory actions
   8. Continuing aspirations and expectations of social equity
   9. Prevailing value system, ideologies, and cultural characteristics
   10. Need to solve or to alleviate some problems immediately

B. Consider potential institutional constraints
   1. Which sector of the institution will support the policy; which sector will not?
   2. Which individuals within the institution will support the policy; which will not?
   3. Is the institution likely to have the resources in faculty, in facilities, and in administration to implement this policy? Does it now have the resources to begin?
   4. What about the legal status of the policy? Do any laws have to be changed? Does the state legislature have to act?
   5. What interests might be against the policy in other state institutions; in the state board of regents, or in other state bodies of higher educational control?
   6. Will the community support the policy?
   7. How much will the implementation of the policy cost? Where will the funds be found?
   8. Other factors peculiar to the institution?

WORKSHEET ONE: Examining Feasibility

What will be the effect of the external influences on the proposed policies?

Proposed Policies	External Influences							
	Population	Government	Global Affairs	Environment	Economy	Science & Technology	Other	Other
1.								
2.								
3.								
4.								
5.								
6.								
7.								
8.								
9.								
10.								

WORKSHEET TWO: Examining Feasibility

What will be the effect of the internal influences on the proposed policies?

	Internal Influences							
Proposed Policies	Institutional Values	Tradition of Governance	Economic Strength	Academic Quality	Institutional Status	Research Capabilities	Internal Demographic Patterns	Relationships with Governing Bodies
1.								
2.								
3.								
4.								
5.								
6.								
7.								
8.								
9.								
10.								

Stage 8

Formulating the Policy Statements

The development of policy statements to guide an institution through planned change is a culminating activity of the entire futures planning process. The formulation of policies requires an overview of the completed plan and a complete understanding of the information, predictions, and conclusions accumulated in successive planning stages.

Basic outlines for policy will be well in place if the planning process has followed the stages of this guide.

Each statement should include a well-defined goal or related goals, their anticipated impact, the resources and strategies for achieving the objectives, and the identification of indicators for evaluation.

The policy statement can be outlined:

1) Objective
2) Assessment and evaluation (indicators)
3) Implementation strategy
4) Resource Implications

This outline suggests, however, a simplicity that may be difficult to achieve. The problem for planners is essentially one of organizing, editing, and writing. They will have at hand an abundance of information ranging from the detailed minutes of routine meetings to accumulations of statistical data and opinions and recommendations from all strata of the institution. What should be used for the most effective statement?

If only broad generalities are used, targets that should be seen precisely will be blurred. If policy statements are laden with lengthy detail, interest and comprehension may be deflected. Planners have the difficult task of winnowing their abundant materials and reducing their information to statements that are minimal but direct and informative.

Good organization, good editing, and good writing cannot be prescribed. However, policy statements should be free of educational jargon, topical buzz words, and self-styled hyphenations that are sometimes used to suggest a rarefied knowledge rather than an earnest attempt to communicate.

If a sincere effort is being made to launch a vital plan, policy statements will be aimed at a wide range of constituents, including faculty, staff, alumni, governing boards, various media, and the public. Those which are direct, will contain only relevant and supportive information, and will be free from obfuscation. These will have greater probabilities for success.

Stage 8

Formulating the Policy Statements

A. Consider the elements to be included in each policy
   1. Clear statement of goal
   2. Clear statement of the objectives which actualize the policy
   3. Clear statement of the means for the achievement of the objectives and the strategies for implementation
   4. Presentation of indicators to be utilized in evaluation
   5. Statement of the anticipated impact on the institution

B. Decide on the priority of the policies viewed as a whole and within sectors

C. Determine the style and format of the formulation of the policies
   1. Be mindful of both the external audience and internal audience
   2. Use concise and clear language while at the same time allowing for some flexibility to handle change

WORKSHEET: Formulating the Policy Statements

Policy Statement No. _____

Objectives:

Indicators:

Strategies:

Resource Implications:

Stage 9

Presenting the Plan

At this stage, the planning committee will have completed its designs and the plan is ready for presentation.

Members of the planning team who have finished their assignment will have developed a strong loyalty to and sense of ownership of their work; their enthusiasm must be tempered with the realization that all of their colleagues may not share their confidence. The widest possible spectrum of faculty and staff support must be sought and encouraged.

Methods of presentation will vary according to size, conventional procedures and custom, prescribed rules of governance, and possibly, a prescription for presentation of the plan as included in the original charge given to the planning committee.

Whatever the devices of presentation, the committee should use existing opportunities to present the plan on a platform of recognizable institutional improvement, whether long or short term. Change is recommended to achieve specific, definable, and desirable goals. It is assumed that objectives and strategies were demanded in planning; certainly, they should be defensible in presentation.

Within institutional custom and guidelines, the planning committee can consider the effects of an edited version of plans for initial presentation, deleting detailed explanations, outlines, and rationale. Simple statements of goals and purposes make smaller targets and can have sharper impact. More extended discussion can be reserved for the inevitable debates of major recommendations for change. If, however, the planning has been a significant focus on campus or if personnel are demanding, a complete statement of particulars may be in order, including all data. The scale of the presentation must be a calculated decision of the planning committee which should have an understanding of prevailing attitudes.

Within this range of presentation is also the matter of format, along with editing, printing, and distribution. Should the plan be duplicated, printed? Distributed by hand, mail, as part of current publications (e.g. bulletins, faculty newsletters), a personal letter? Is an endorsement by the president of the institution and/or the executive officer of the board appropriate?

If the plans include a revised mission statement, should this be submitted separately? In what format?

Significant policy statements that are central to any changes in planning should be set forth clearly with all supporting documentation, and criteria. Methods of assessment and evaluation should be included in the initial presentation to alleviate apprehension.

Should the team celebrate the completion of the plan or wait to celebrate its adoption? Again, no prescription is appropriate, but it is important that these questions be answered and plans for presentation be formally approved. Certainly, good planning should not fail because of a poor launch.

Stage 9

Presenting the Plan

A. The actual content of the document
   1. Overview of the process in developing the institutional futures plan
   2. A futures scenario
   3. Institutional purposes and goal statement
   4. Clear statement of policies
   5. Statement of impact of each policy on the institution
   6. Data representations
   7. General activities and strategies involved in implementation
   8. Evaluation and assessment plan

B. The format of the document
   1. Treatment
      a. Companion look to other university documents
      b. Specialized, unique approach
   2. Organizational arrangement
   3. Design

C. The manner of presentation to the university community
   1. At an overall meeting of the university and its staff?
   2. At each level of administration?
   3. Through campus media?

D. The manner of presentation to external constituencies
   1. Who?
   2. How?
   3. When?
   4. What? How much?

Stage 10

Revisiting the Plan

Final approval and formal adoption of a recommended plan does not terminate all of the functional aspects of planning. At this stage, although the projected provisions for implementation and assessment are made operative and a design for monitoring should be in place, periodic overviews should also be scheduled.

A specified design for revisiting the plan on a regular basis (perhaps annually or biannually), including the identification of personnel who will be responsible for continuing review, should be a part of the plan. Their collective responsibility will be to answer questions such as: Is the plan adequate to its intentions? Is the plan operating in conditions as predicted? If predictions have not been realized, to what extent should planning be revised? Have new opportunities developed to enhance or accelerate expected outcomes?

The frequency and scope of revisiting are determined by the scale and complexity of the plan itself. Keys or criteria can and should be specified and can be quantitative as in, for example, figures related to budget, enrollment, admissions, test scores, endowment, etc., or qualitative in estimates of, for example, faculty morale, support of constituencies and governing boards, the productivity of faculty development, and other appraisals that are largely judgmental.

One advantage of placing detailed provisions for revisiting in a plan before its adoption is the avoidance at a later time of a previously unscheduled review being seen as necessitated by frailty or failure or one motivated by inimical interests. If revisits are scheduled as part of a plan, they will be seen as a part of the routine of the plan.

If a plan is complex and inclusive, a formal report of revisits will probably contribute to continuing support and cooperation. During a long time, momentum can wane, enthusiasm can fade, and a good plan can lose vitality if deprived of reminders of progress and success.

Futures planning is, by definition, a process dependent upon the variables of speculative predictions of which some will inevitably be inexact. Scheduled revisiting, in combination with continuing evaluation and assessment as outlined in Stage 5, can accommodate the need for corrections and revisions and will contribute to a firmer base for implementation while binding constituent support and confidence.